

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office action mailed on May 24, 2006, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ullman et al. (U.S. Patent 6,330,595, hereinafter “Ullman”). The Examiner’s arguments set forth in the Office action have been carefully reviewed. However, the rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Regarding independent claim 1, claim 1 recites a method for transmitting “video signals” comprising the step of transmitting “said video signals” to one or more receiving devices. Ullman does not disclose, teach or suggest such a method because the system in Ullman does not transmit video signals. Rather, the system in Ullman, such as that shown in Fig. 1, transmits only the uniform resource locators (URLs) to a receiving device (Local Personal Computer box 16). URLs do not contain video signals. URLs are locators that “direct the user’s computer 16 to address locations, or Web sites, . . . to retrieve the video presentation.” (see column 4, lines 41-54). In fact, Ullman emphasizes on the fact that its system transmits “only” the URLs, not full Web pages or visual parts, to the receiving device 16 because the bandwidth capacity of the line connecting the network to the receiving device 16 is limited (see column 5, lines 13-19). Since Ullman does not disclose, teach or suggest the method or step of transmitting “video signals” to the receiving device 16, independent claim 1 is patentable over Ullman.

Furthermore, the Examiner’s rejection to claim 1 stated on page 3 of the Office Action is respectfully traversed because many elements the Examiner states in the rejection do not show the elements recited in the claim. Specifically, the Examiner states that in column 4, lines 55-60 and column 5, lines 20-30, Ullman show the step of receiving video signals from a “non-networked” video origination device. However, column 4, lines 55-60 and column 5, lines 20-30 do not disclose or suggest a “non-networked” device. The Examiner also states that column 12, lines 1-34 of Ullman show the step of transmitting “video” signals. Again, column 12, lines 1-34 does not show “video” signals being transmitted. Finally, the Examiner states that column 9, lines 40-65 show that the “video receiving devices have all the software or hardware modifications for compatibility” (emphasis added). However, claim 1 does not recite that the “receiving” device having all software or hardware modifications. What claim 1

recites is the video “origination” device that does not require hardware or software modifications (see last paragraph of claim 1). Thus, the Examiner has not shown all the elements recited in claim 1. From the reasons set forth above, independent claim 1 clearly does not read on Ullman, hence is believed patentable over Ullman.

Regarding independent claim 13, similar to independent claim 1, claim 13 recites a method for transmitting “video signals.” As discussed above, Ullman’s system does not disclose, teach or suggest a method for transmitting “video signals.” In addition, claim 13 recites that the video signals being transmitted to at least one “non-networked” video receiving device. In the Office Action, page 5, lines 1-3, The Examiner states in the Office Action, page 5, lines 1-3 that column 12, lines 1-34 of Ullman shows such “non-networked” video receiving device. However, column 12, lines 1-34, which describe the system in Fig. 9, do not show a “non-networked” receiving device. In Fig. 9 of Ullman, the receiving devices 188 do not receive “video” signals and are not “non-networked” devices, as called for in claim 13. Therefore, claim 13 does not read on Ullman, hence is believed patentable over Ullman.

Claims 2-12 are dependent on claim 1. Thus, claims 2-12 are also believed patentable over Ullman for at least the same reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Moreover, claim 2 calls for a “non-networked” client device. However, Ullman’s system does not disclose, teach, or suggest any client device that are non-networked. The Examiner also refers to column 7, lines 50-67 in Ullman. However, such section does not appear to be related to any feature recited in claim 2.

Regarding claim 4, the rejection to claim 4 is respectfully traversed because column 5, lines 30-35 cited by the Examiner refers to the receiving device (computer 16), not to the video origination device as called for in claim 4.

Regarding claims 5 and 6, the rejections to claims 5 and 6 are respectfully traversed because the receiving device 16 in Ullman does not receive “video” signals as called for in claims 5 and 6. As explained above with regard to claim 1, the receiving device 16 in Ullman receives only the URLs, not video signals.

Regarding claim 7, the rejection to claim 7 is respectfully traversed because column 9, lines 25-31 do not disclose, teach or suggest the step of converting the video

signals from analog to digital signal as called for in claim 7. The analog-to-digital converting step in claim 7 is part of the method for transmitting video signals to a receiving device. Column 9, lines 25-30 of Ullman, on the other hand, refer to the video signals being stored onto a DVD so that the user can put the DVD into a DVD player to view the video presentation. Storing the video signals onto a DVD is not part of the method of transmitting video signals to a receiving device as called for in claim 7. Therefore, claim 7 is believed patentable over Ullman.

Regarding claim 8, the rejection to claim 8 is respectfully traversed because the filter mentioned in column 7, line 25 of Ullman is not for filtering the video signals as called for in claim 8. The filter in column 7, line 25 of Ullman is for filtering the URLs, not video signals, for the purpose of sending appropriate URLs to a specific user according to their interests, demographics, history or behavior in the system (column 7, lines 26-29).

Regarding claims 9 and 10, the rejections to claims 9 and 10 are respectfully traversed because column 9, lines 55-65 refer to compressing and decompressing the URLs, not video signals, recited in claims 9 and 10.

Claims 14-20 are dependent on Claim 13. Accordingly, claims 14-20 are believed to be patentable over Ullman for at least the same reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 13.

Moreover, the rejection to claim 14 is respectfully traversed for the same reasons set forth in the argument with respect to claim 1 above because claim 14 recites the same feature recited in claim 1. The rejections to claims 18-20 are also respectfully traversed for the same reasons set forth in the arguments in regard to claims 7-9 above, respectively, because they recite the same features.


For all the aforementioned reasons, the withdraw of the rejection to claims 1-20 based on Ullman and the allowance of claims 1-20 are respectfully requested.

Correspondence and Fees

Please charge the fee for a Three Month Extension of Time of One Thousand Twenty Dollars (\$1,020.00) to Deposit Account No. 03-3839. No additional fees are believed to be necessitated by the instant response. However, should this be in error, authorization is hereby given to charge Deposit Account no. 03-3839 for any underpayment, or to credit any overpayments.

Please address all correspondence to the correspondent address for **Customer No. 26345 of Intellectual Docket Administrator, Gibbons, Del Deo, Dolan, Griffinger & Vecchione**, One Riverfront Plaza, Newark, NJ 07102-5497. Telephone calls should be made to Abhik A. Huq at (215) 446-6268 and fax communications should be sent directly to him at 215-446-6309.

Respectfully submitted,


Abhik A. Huq
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 40,656

Date: 11/7/2001

Gibbons, Del Deo, Dolan,
Griffinger & Vecchione, P.C.
1700 Two Logan Square
18th and Arch Streets
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103